

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: DE3CEF0FBBCC5F27852578690055D11E

From: "Fox, Steve \ (New Bedford\)" <Steve.Fox@jacobs.com>

To: "Fox, Steve \ (New Bedford\)" <Steve.Fox@jacobs.com>; Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; "Gouveia, Mark" <Mark.Gouveia@jacobs.com>; "Anderson, Michael \ (Boston\)" <Michael.Anderson@jacobs.com>; ElaineT Stanley/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>; "Mitkevicius, K C" <K.C.Mitkevicius@nae02.usace.army.mil>

Delivered Date: 03/04/2009 10:09 AM EDT

Subject: RE: comments on draft hybrid cost est. @ \$80m - Conference Call at 10 AM today

Hi Everyone,

The conference call number below is already being used. Please use the normal call in number for the weekly call and Paul will chair it from the site.

Sorry for the delay.

Thanks,

steve

-----Original Message-----

From: Fox, Steve (New Bedford)

Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2009 9:30 AM

To: 'dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov'; Gouveia, Mark; Anderson, Michael (Boston); 'stanley.elainet@epamail.epa.gov'; Rigassio-Smith, Anita; 'Mitkevicius, K C'

Subject: RE: comments on draft hybrid cost est. @ \$80m - Conference Call at 10 AM today

Hi Everyone,

As discussed during today's phone call, we will have a conference call at 10AM to discuss Dave's comments below. The following is the call in number:

866-365-4406

Code - 3777063

Thanks,

Steve

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2009 11:52 AM

To: K.C.Mitkevicius@nae02.usace.army.mil; maurice.beaudoin@usace.army.mil;
Robert.A.Leitch@usace.army.mil; paul.g.l'heureux@usace.army.mil; Fox, Steve
(New Bedford); Rigassio-Smith, Anita; Gouveia, Mark
Cc: Catri.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov; Peterson.David@epamail.epa.gov;
Ng.ManChak@epamail.epa.gov; Gutro.Doug@epamail.epa.gov;
Brill.Larry@epamail.epa.gov; Falvey.Jeanethe@epamail.epa.gov;
stanley.elainet@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: comments on draft hybrid cost est. @ \$80m

Hi - here are my comments on the subject estimate:

1. ALL years should be assumed to be \$80 million, including year #1. The \$80m should NOT be escalated with inflation as we'd be well above the "bare minimum" of funding that would require inflationary adjustments.
2. In year #2 "ROD signed" should be changed to "ESD signed" just to avoid confusion.
3. Why not fill the LHCC in year #3, rather than having it sit empty until year #4?
4. I would include a line item showing the cost to instal the LHCC silt curtain.
5. An LTM round #6 should be added (escalated for inflation) for year #5.
6. The NPV of \$303.1m seems high compared to the initial (called-back) version of \$293.6m - which one is correct?

Thanks - Dave

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.